

REMARKS

Reconsideration and further examination of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

In the final Office action mailed February 6, 2004, claims 1 and 16-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,517,578 to Altman ("Altman"). Claims 2-15 and 18-36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious based on Altman in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,682,439 to Beernink ("Beernink"). All objections and rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 16 and 27 by incorporating the limitations of claims 3, 19 and 30, respectively therein. Claims 3, 19 and 30, moreover, have been canceled without prejudice. No new matter is being introduced. Applicants submit that, as amended, the claims are allowable.

More specifically, claim 1, as amended, recites in relevant part as follows:

1. "A system for managing ink information in a computer system having a pen-based input tablet, the system comprising:"

"an ink manager coupled to the pen driver for receiving the ink strokes, the ink manager having an ink phrase termination engine configured to examine the ink information collected by the pen driver and, upon detecting the occurrence of an ink phrase termination event, to identify a respective end of an ink phrase to the ink manager" and

"whereby the ink manager stores the ink strokes received prior to the ink phrase termination event in a selected ink phrase data structure and, in response to **receiving from the client application a reference context affiliated with the un-recognized ink strokes of the ink phrase, associates the reference context with the ink strokes.**"

In other words, claim 1 is directed, at least in part, to an ink manager that receives a “reference context” from the **client application** and then associates that received “reference context” with the **un-recognized** ink strokes. Applicants direct the Examiner’s attention to the following description of the term “reference context”, which is taken from the Specification at p. 15, lines 4-15:

Upon receiving the ink phrase via the end-of-phrase callback, the application 302a may provide the ink manager 310 with an application-generated **reference context** (REF CON) for the ink phrase. The REF CON may simply be a tag generated by the application 302a for internally identifying or providing other information regarding the ink phrase. More typically, the REF CON may be a pointer to a data structure containing a variety of information **of use to the application** 302a. The REF CON is appended to the respective ink phrase data structure 332, e.g., by inserting it at field 508 (Fig. 5), as indicated at block 424. It should be understood that the ink manager 310 may still associate the REF CON with the corresponding ink strokes passed to the application 302a without appending the REF CON to the ink phrase data structure 332. For example, the ink manager 310 may store the REF CON in some other data structure or memory which is accessible by it.

That is, a “reference context” is something identified by the client application being used, such as a word processing application, a drawing application, an e-mail application, as relating to the ink information being entered by the user. As recited in claim 1, as amended, the ink manger receives a “reference context” from the client application and associates this reference context with the collected ink strokes. In this way, an application can make much greater use of the ink information than is possible or even contemplated by the art of record.

The final Office action cites to Figs. 5-7 of Beernink as purportedly teaching this limitation. Applicants respectfully disagree. As described in Beernink’s BRIEF DE-

DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS, Figs. 5-7 illustrate a pop-up window on the computer's display screen showing proposed recognition results for ink information entered by a user. Applicants direct the Examiner's attention to Col. 10, lines 17-30, which state as follows:

FIG. 5 illustrates a response of the boxed input correction system to the selected word 164 being selected to invoke a pop-up corrector 168 in accordance with one embodiment of the present invention. The pop-up corrector 168 provides an alternates list 170, an ink word 172, a keyboard button 174, and a boxed input corrector (BIC) selector button 176. The alternates list 170 provides the user with some character strings which the **recognition software** believes are close matches for the ink word 172. The ink word 172 represents the original strokes which comprised the word which the user entered. Selecting the keyboard button 174 will display a keyboard window. Once the keyboard window is displayed, the user can select desired characters from the keyboard via the stylus 110.

Thus, what Beernink is disclosing in Figs. 5-7 is a pop-up window that contains a list 170 of results generated by its handwriting recognition software, in response to the "ink information" entered by the user. The user can then select the correct word from the alternates list 170.

Neither the pop-up window 168 nor the alternates list 170 can be equated with Applicant's claimed "reference context". First, claim 1 expressly recites that the reference context is **received from the client application**. In contrast, Beernink's pop-up window 168 and alternates 170 are generated by the handwriting recognition software. Second, claim 1 further recites that the "reference context" is affiliated with **un-recognized ink strokes**. As clearly shown in Figs. 5-7 of Beernink, the ink strokes have already been recognized and several alternative recognition hypotheses have been presented to the user. For example, as clearly shown in Figs. 5 and 6, Beernink's recogni-

tion software has performed its recognition analysis on the ink information entered by the user, and has presented the following alternative hypotheses to the user:

Correct
correct
Currect
Cwrect
currect

Obviously, these alternative hypotheses could not have been produced on “un-recognized” ink strokes.

Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, is allowable over the art of record for at least these reasons.

Independent claims 16 and 27, which have also been amended to recite the receipt of a reference context from the client application are also allowable for similar reasons.

Claims 2-15, 17-26 and 28-36 depend from allowable base claims and are thus also allowable.

Early favorably action is respectfully requested.

Please charge any additional fee occasioned by this paper to our Deposit Account No. 03-1237.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. Reinemann
Reg. No. 38,280
CESARI AND MCKENNA, LLP
88 Black Falcon Avenue
Boston, MA 02210-2414
(617) 951-2500